

STOR

378.748

POP18984

378.748

POP 1898.4



378.748

POP 1898.4

INDIVIDUALISM

IN

EDUCATION .

by

Jesse H. Michener.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

--+++++-----

	Page
INTRODUCTION.	4,
1. Individualism a well-recognized term.	
2. Educational theory is individualistic.	
3. The use of the term in this thesis defined.	
4. A purely individualistic plan not advocated.	
5. The relation of Evolution to Individualism.	
6. The Individual and society.	
7. Education must deal with the individual child.	

CHAPTER I.	10.
------------	-----

A BRIEF HISTORIC SKETCH OF INDIVIDUALISM.

1. The term defined.	
2. Man a social being.	
3. Hobbes' and Rousseau's theories of society.	
4. Origin and development of society.	
5. The earlier forms of society and government.	
6. Formation of permanent tribes and the earlier monarchies. Asia, collective; Europe individualistic.	

CHAPTER I. (Cont'd)

7. Individualism in ancient Greece.
 8. Davidson's estimate of Greek civilization.
 9. Roman collectivism and its result.
 10. Mediaeval collectivism.
 11. Abelard's claim for individual judgment.
 12. Personal freedom in Holland and Friesland.
 13. Collectivism in China.
 14. The Renaissance and the Reformation.
 15. Effect of the revival of learning.
 16. The progress of society individualistic, -
Sir H. Maine.
 17. Individualism and the Reformation. -
Draper.
 18. Individualism in America.
 19. A present tendency to collectivism in America.
 20. Development of individuality in American
character.
 21. State interference not wholly collective.
 22. Spencer's individualism.
-

---E+++++E---

EVILS OF COLLECTIVISM IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

1. Modern demand for universal education.
2. The government must meet this demand.
3. System necessary to public education.
4. Tutorial and public education compared.
5. Collectivism, a serious evil in present school-work.
6. Individual differences important and should be noted in school-work and conduct.
7. Necessity for caution in making changes in school-systems.
8. Present uniformity unnatural.
9. Individualistic method adopted by the wealthy.
10. The collective system not economical.
11. Effect of collective methods on the teacher.
12. Classification necessary and based on fact.
13. Fault lies in not noting individual differences.
14. System to be approved, but must be elastic.
15. What our graded schools should be.

CHAPTER I I I .

50.

-+-+++++

EDUCATIONAL THEORY IS INDIVIDUALISTIC.

1. All definitions of Education are individualistic.
2. The theoretic, average child.
3. Basis of classification of pupils.
4. Relation of pedagogic theory to other sciences -- Psychology, Ethics, Sociology, Economics, Politics, Theology.
5. These Sciences individualistic.

CHAPTER I V.

62.

-----+

APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUALISM TO PEDAGOGY.

1. Definition of individualistic teaching.
2. Full knowledge of the child first requisite.
3. Knowledge of the child's development second requisite.
4. Individualistic work must be based on these two conditions.
5. The mental analysis and measurement necessary.
6. A systematic scheme for scientific work necessary.

CHAPTER IV. (Cont'd)

7. Present examples of individualistic teaching.
8. Small classes essential to individualistic teaching.
9. Use of auxiliary teachers and pupil-assistants.
10. Thring's estimate of twenty-five pupils for one teacher.
11. Present plan permits of more individualistic work than is now done.
12. Many teachers are wanting in accurate knowledge of individual pupils.
13. Detention of pupils for lessons individualistic, but not an approved plan.
14. Child-study.
15. Pupils should be arranged in small classes.
16. A record of each pupil should be kept.
17. The principle, not the plan of individual teaching, is the important point.

- - - - -

CHAPTER V .

82.

-+++++-----

THE IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUALISM IN TEACHING.

1. General importance of individualism.
2. Importance of individualistic teaching to psychology.

CHAPTER V. (Cont'd)

3. Economic importance of individualistic training.
4. Importance of individualistic training in morals.
5. Social changes are to be effected through the individual.
6. In Politics democracy is largely individualistic.
7. Proper leadership in a democracy to come from individual training.
8. Religious training is largely individualistic.
9. Importance of individualistic training to Pedagogy.

P R E F A C E .

Education has become a popular talisman. It is to avert every evil and gain every good. This exaggerated estimate has tended to produce something of a reaction among those who see its limits and know with more accuracy its real power. Still this sublime faith in the teachableness of men is not without warrant, and the importance of education in its widest limits can scarcely be over-stated.

Fiske says, "Inherited tendencies and aptitudes still form the foundation of character; but the individual experience has come to count as an enormous factor in modifying the career of mankind from generation to generation . It is not too much to say that the difference between man and all other living creatures in respect of teachableness, progressiveness, and individuality of character surpasses all other differences of kind that are known to exist in the universe."

1

With such popular approval and such scientific endorsement nothing of importance to education can be unimportant. Whatever is to improve educational methods or help to perfect its art must be thus important. To show that individualism in teaching will improve educational work and methods and is a pedagogical factor of prime importance is the purpose of this thesis.

All who are familiar with educational literature know how much has been written in criticism of present methods. Dr. Maudsley says, "The ordinary education of the day systematically leaves undeveloped a vast amount of mentality in the race." Carlyle states, "What a boundless outlook that of schools and of improvement in school-methods and school-purposes, which, in these ages lie hitherto all superannuated and, to a frightful degree, inapplicable."

Though popular education has not produced all that was hoped for, our faith in it is not lost. We only strive the more to discover cause of failure and correct it. More is being expended to-day than every before upon education.

A generation ago comparatively little had been written on the subject, and that received but slight attention ; now education has a voluminous literature, and is widely recog-

nized as a profession. States have spent millions in establishing and maintaining special schools of pedagogy. Colleges and Universities have given it a chair, placed its textbooks in their libraries, and granted it scholarships. If the teacher proves worthy of these opportunities, the profession thus endowed and honored, need no longer be a menial calling.

To add much that is new and valuable to educational theory or practice is worthy the efforts of the ablest minds. Thus to add to it in the slightest degree cannot be an unworthy ambition.

INTRODUCTION.

Individualism is a well-recognized term. It has received due attention in ethics, sociology, and politics, but in pedagogy it has not been so well-defined or specifically treated. Its importance, however, cannot be questioned, for whatever is prominent in the life and thought of a people must be, or come to be, important in its educational system.

In the State it is the political equality of the individual citizen that has been the watch-word for liberty in the latter half of the eighteenth, and all of the nineteenth century.

The individual is the unit in sociology; and sociology has not only conquered a place in the circle of sciences, but claims to give Economics its proper "point of view."

One great school of economists has adopted as its basic principle the unit of pleasure which each individual obtains in consumption.

In ethics Egotism makes individual happiness its cardinal principle, and Universal Hedonism admits the necessity of harmonizing general happiness with individual happiness if we are to avoid a fundamental contradiction, and "opening the door to universal skepticism."¹

Experimental psychology attempts to reach its general truths by induction. It is based on the results obtained by the analyses of individual minds, and the observation of mental phenomena in individuals.

Pedagogical theory is largely based on these sciences, hence it is fair to infer that it, too, must make individualism an important subject, in its systematic development.

Pedagogy does base its theory on the individual, but in practice it is not always consistent; and here, as elsewhere, the individual is often lost. Collectivism, not individualism, controls our practice in dealing with the masses. This comes from present necessities, and from a survival of that social condition in which the masses had no rights which their lordly masters were bound to respect.

-- -- -- -- --

1. Sidgwick, The Method of Ethics. P. 508.

A change, however, has come. Political and religious freedom for the individual are assured, if not yet completely attained. Economic freedom for each one is now demanded. Educators everywhere are deploring the evil results of the "lock-step" in educational systems. A few have endeavored to formulate and reduce to practice a plan whereby each is to receive his just share of the education which the state gives to all. This thesis is an attempt to give a systematic discussion of this problem.

By Individualism in education we mean the adaptation of education both in matter and method to the needs of each individual. This does not necessarily mean teaching each child separately and singly, but it does mean noting, and, to some extent at least, being governed by, the specific differences of each child.

This leads us to note the difference between teaching an individual child and teaching a child as an individual. The former process has in view one child; i. e. any one child; the latter sees each particular child; but Individualism would lead us to consider the varying capabilities and peculiarities of each child.

Individualism in teaching does not require a pupil

to be taught separately or alone, but only that he be not taught as an indifferent one among many. Indeed it can be shown that the individuality of the pupil is best developed by a well-ordered association with other pupils, and much of his instruction and training given in common with his classmates. Individual work is supplemental to much of the work of the school; for each pupil has more points than differences in common with his fellows.

Although this individual work is supplemental to the general work of the class, yet Individualism is a fundamental factor in a correct system of pedagogy, as it is the individual child that is to be taught collectively and similarly with others where it is best for him, but separately and differently wherein his peculiarities or his surroundings demand it.

An absolutely individualistic scheme or system of education is not desirable. The unity of society is a fact. Civilized men are mutually dependent, and no one would wish to advocate any theory in education that would tend to disorganize or to disintegrate society, or to make any one less mindful of his social duties.

Evolution tends to increase and to emphasize differences in civilized men; but this is not a centrifugal force,

it is really only an individualizing of the separate units, making each more dependent rather than independent, for the part taken by each individual is more and more specialized.

All still harmoniously revolve about the great central power which holds and moves the universe as "one stupendous whole." To be in harmony the part must move with the whole; but the part may also be self-centered in respect of self, and have an individual movement of its own.

This latter condition is an essential one in education. There is a harmonious development of the individual as an entity, as well as development as an integral part of the social system. This is the harmonious development of all the powers of the individual, and is one of the definitions of education.

Educational practice must deal with the concrete, individual child, often a very stubborn fact; and educational theory must formulate a true method to guide this practice. Educational science must properly account for every pedagogic fact.

Each individual child is a most important fact to himself, and should be to all; we are not only our brother's

keeper, but as far as may be, his child's keeper.

Education is each child's right; hence society's duty is to each as sacredly as to all.

CHAPTER I.

A BRIEF HISTORIC SKETCH OF INDIVIDUALISM.

Both science and revelation affirm that man was not made to "be alone." Man is everywhere a social being, hence may be considered from two points of view: first, as an individual: second, as a social unit, as part of a collective whole.

The reason for collectivism is a question for philosophy, thus of theoretic interest only. Hobbes made the antagonistic principle dominant in the individual; but being endowed with reason he saw the necessity of society and government for self preservation. Though war was his natural state, peace was necessary to his existence.

As far as it relates to the conscious formation of government this theory has no historic or even ethnological confirmation. The "contract social" of Rousseau is a similar solution, equally theoretic and unhistoric.

Present social and political conditions are undoubtedly the result of evolution. Just what their beginnings were we may not know, but their development has been carefully studied, and Sociology, Politics, Economics, are recognized as sciences from which we may learn what part Individualism has played in this development.

In the earliest, or may be, the lowest forms of society and government there is greater equality among men than in more highly developed conditions. Marked differentiation is a concomitant if not a cause of development in man. The sameness of the earlier condition made individualistic distinction of little moment. The absence of division of labor prevented that interdependence which is the closely-knitted bond of modern society. A common danger is the bond uniting the lowest of wild, savage tribes; and a natural leader becomes the governing power. But when emergency is past, and fear no longer holds together these slightly differentiated, social units, there is no recognized chief. This condition might be called primitive social or political individualism. Its next step would be the continuance of this

chieftaincy and the formation of a tribe. Extend this by the domination of the strongest tribe, and the agglomerated military nation is the result.

Here there is a comparatively homogeneous mass held together by the external band of absolute authority, governing through fear. The individuals being similar and massed, are lost in this crude collectivism. Here are the earlier extremes, the primitive individualism, and its succeeding despotic collectivism. Ancient, great, oriental monarchies were of this class.

The Eastern world is filled with arrested, political development, or terminated development of inferior order. Asia has produced enormous, national masses, but only of a low order of individual development.

To Europe belongs the truest individualistic development, and the highest type of nationality.

A progressive movement has everywhere shown the growth of individualism both in obligation and rights. Not the groups, but the individual has tended to become the social and political unit.¹

Ancient Greece was the beginning of modern civili-

- - - - -

1. Sir Henry Maine's Ancient Law, (Social Evolution, P. 56)

zation, and here we fixed the best examples of well-developed collectivism, as ancient Sparta; -- and also the first extreme individualistic development -- Athens in her intellectual supremacy.

The strength and worth, as well as the weaknesses of each, Davidson portrays in his "Education of the Greek People."¹

When Sparta's sons knew only Sparta she was invincible; but for men to live only for a body politic is to ignore the spiritual in man. The soul is individual as well as immortal, and cannot be merged and lost in any collective mass.

The sophists, seeing clearly that mind and not matter was dominant, seemed driven logically to the conclusion that sentient man was the interpreter of all things. But man was the individual, man. Protagoras, formulating for all time the famous sophistry, "Man is the measure of all things," earned the title, "The Individualist."

Socrates, the first of the world's philosophical collosi, saw the fundamental error of this position; but also the element of truth that made it plausible. Each indi-

- - - - -

1. Davidson, Chapter V.

vidual can only as far as he is able gain knowledge or attain wisdom; but the filled measure does not mean all of knowledge nor the whole of wisdom. The partial truth was of opinion; philosophy sought the whole truth and the perfect wisdom. That it should fail was inevitable, for perfection is not of man. But Socrates has glorified the failure in making clear the fatal defect of extreme individualism.

"Socrates, though he was not enabled to save his country from ruin, was permitted to discover the principle by which social order of a far higher type and more inclusive reach was rendered possible for the whole world."¹

Universal truth was his quest; he hoped to make it the "basis of a new, social order, and the material of a new education."² Individualism in the form of opinion, became dominant, disintegrated society, and so weakened the national life that it could not survive in the struggle with Macedonian power and Roman conquest. Nor did the teachings of Socrates tend to counteract this tendency. While he made clear the inadequacy of mere opinion, he also sought to es-

1. Davidson, Ed. Greek People. Page 105,

2. Davidson, Ed. Greek People, " 109.

establish reflective thought as the goal of mental development.

Education was to produce the philosopher, if possible; but philosophy alone does not tend to produce the man of action, a quality essential to affairs of state and trade.

Thus Socrates aided the individualism which undermined the Greek state. Yet, if there be "nothing great in the world but man, and nothing great in man but mind," he wrought for the greatest possible good.

What matters the fall of Greek oligarchy or Greek democracy if on their ruin flourished that personal development which is the true glory of every age and race.

The development of man, not the conservations of institutions determines the value of a principle. Measured thus Individualism did more for Greece and for the world than did Spartan state, Athenian unity, or Macedonian phalanx.

¹
Davidson says, of this, "The process whereby the Greek man disentangled himself from the Greek citizen and laid claim to a world in which the citizen had no part. In doing this he set an example for all the world, and began a new era in human history, -- the era of moral freedom. I have treated this change and its causes with some detail

and emphasis, because I think that certain educational and social phenomenon of our own time show that its meaning has not even now been generally apprehended with any clearness, that we do not yet know how to take full advantage of the victory which the Greeks won for us. In education we are still trying to obtain socially desirable results by means of habit, surroundings, and institutional sanctions, instead of directly appealing, through the intelligence, to the moral nature and rousing in it the consciousness of universality -- or autonomy, which is at bottom the same thing.

In social life we are allowing economic complications to make us look with a half-favorable eye upon schemes which would, if realized, go far to identify again the man with the citizen, and to deprive him of his moral liberty, through which alone he is man, for the sake of physical comfort, the enjoyment of which does not differentiate him from the pig -- to use the plain word of Socrates.

We are not keeping with sufficient steadiness before our eyes the fact, revealed so clearly by the history of Greek education, that the possibility of continuous progress in civilization depends upon our not sacrificing the freedom of the individual to any ideal static institution

which may promise a certain more or less uniform modicum of well-being for all. We are forgetting that the ultimate good of man consists not in what he has, but in what he is, and that he can be nothing at all except through the exercise of moral freedom which may celebrate some of its noblest victories through that very struggle which our present tendencies are trying to eliminate from life."

Rome is the great example of institutional life. Individualism here found development only in citizenship. It produced patriots but not philosophers. It had the power, but Greece the glory. Rome's great schools were the forum, and the army with the latter was dominant. This precluded any true individual development. Rome was a camp, and as such subdued the barbarian, giving him civic habits, but he was educated by Greece. This universal dominion of Rome brought tranquillity and material prosperity, but it was the peace of a perfect collectivism. This personal subserviency to the great central power of the empire, and the equally subservient copying of Greek intellectual masters ¹ was the "latent cause of decay and corruption."

1. Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Vol. 1, Page 70.

"The minds of men were gradually reduced to the same level, the fire of genius was extinguished, and even the military spirit evaporated." ¹ "In the same manner," says Longinus, "as some children always remain pygmies, whose infant limbs have been too closely confined, thus our tender minds, fettered by the prejudices and habits of a just servitude are unable to expand themselves, or to attain that well-proportioned greatness which we admire in the ancients; who, living under a popular government, wrote with the same freedom as they acted." ² Gibbon adds, "The Roman world was indeed peopled by a race of pygmies; when the fierce giants of the North broke in and mended the puny brood; they restored a manly spirit of freedom; and after the revolution of ten centuries, freedom became the happy parent of taste and science." ³ Rome was essentially political in its development. The state was all in all; when this became despotic and personal independence was destroyed it took with it all individualism and a perfect collectivism remained. National progress and race development are the result of individual

-
1. Ibid,
 2. Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Page 72, Vol. I.
 3. Ibid.

advancement, dependent upon personal liberty. "In nations of antiquity the individual was sacrificed to the state, but state absolutism, although clearly related to socialism, is not to be identified with it.

The direct and immediate cause of the ruin of the Greek cities was neither the falsity of their religion, nor the prevalence of slavery. Each Greek^{city} included two hostile peoples, and civil wars were incessant. This ruined the Greek cities. Rome suffered and died from from the same malady as Greece. Before the close of the Republic she had twice experienced a social revolution of the most sanguinary nature. She sought a refuge and remedy in the empire and at the expense of industry; it fed and pampered an idle population. This solution brought temporary rest, but ended, naturally, in utter exhaustion and ruin.¹"

Greece tried democracy, with individualism dominant, and fell. Rome tried the other extreme and shared the same fate. For stability, then, there must be justice to the individual and a patriotic defence of the state.

- - - - -

1. Flint's "Socialism," P.P. 32, 33.

The period of the middle ages was an era of retrogression and degeneracy.

The learning and culture of Rome and Greece were seemingly lost, and ignorance possessed society. Mankind were indeed a mass. The individual independence of truly barbarous and savage societies was wanting, for both church and state ruled men with despotic power.

The majority were in villanage or actual slavery. The cause of this condition may be in dispute, but the lack of individual freedom and development cannot be questioned. There were exceptions to the general ignorance and lack of originality.

Abelard, the great scholastic philosopher, lighted up the twelfth century by the boldness of his thought, the extent of his scholarship, and the brilliancy of his eloquence. He boldly declared for the supremacy of reason, and the right of the individual not to be required to accept as true what he does not understand. He seemed to accomplish but little permanent good in his own day, his torch serving only to make the surrounding "darkness visible". Yet what he did for the University of Paris was not lost; and Compayre' tells us, "It is permissible to say that in the fol-

lowing centuries Abelard has had as disciples all those who in any degree whatever have maintained the right of reason, and contended for the emancipation of the human mind. He¹ was the precursor of the modern spirit."

What individual freedom could do for a people under the most adverse conditions is strikingly illustrated in Friesland and Holland during the mediaeval period. Quoting from Motley, "In those lands which a niggard nature had apparently condemned to perpetual poverty and obscurity, the principle of reasonable human freedom, without which there is no national prosperity or glory worth contending for, was taking deepest and strongest root.

The powerful commonwealth, at a later period to be evolved out of the great combat between centralized tyranny and the spirit of civil and religious liberty, was already foreshadowed. The elements, of which that important republic was to be compounded, were germinating for centuries. Love of freedom, readiness to strike and bleed at any moment in her cause, manly resistance to despotism, however over-shadowing, were the leading characteristics of the race in all periods, whether among Frisian swamps, Dutch dykes, the gentle hills

1. Abelard, P. 23.

and dales of England, or the pathless forests of America."¹

It is not mere learning but free mental development which advances the race; not mere acquisition but growth.

China for centuries has been learned, yet knows only as the copyist knows his copy. Each succeeding generation is but an accretion to the past. It is this truth which explains the power of the revival of learning in the Renaissance. That period when mankind began again the agonizing struggle from barbarism to civilization. Happily for us this development was individualistic. The reformation declared for the individual in religion. The revival of learning developed the power of personal intellectual attainment."² Revolution brought political liberty. These three movements emancipated modern Europe from mediaeval thraldom."³

The revival of learning, if not the cause of the Renaissance, was one of its chief factors. The intellectual light that ancient thought brought to Europe awakened in men a new and nobler estimate of the dignity and worth of the human

— — — — —

1. Motley's "Dutch Republic," Vol. I, pp. 38, 39.
2. Painter's History of Education, p. 12,
3. Synond's "Renaissance in Italy," Vol. II, p. 530.

mind. Scholarship, rather than church preferment, gave highest honors, but scholarship was personal and could be attained only by individual ability and effort. Each sought for himself the new learning, and, succeeding became a citizen of the "Republic of Letters."

The new life was felt in every part of western Europe, developing in each country as the national environment determined. Everywhere it was progressive; for it is the intellectual progress of a country that determines its real progress. This is the foundation of its real advancement.¹ And is everywhere individualistic, since "The hall of science is the temple of Democracy."²

The establishment of nationalities created citizenship and gave to it rights and privileges that have grown into the civil liberty of to-day.

3

Sir Henry Maine states, says Kidd, that "The movement of progressive societies has been uniform in one respect. Throughout its course we have everywhere to trace the growth of individual obligation and the substitution of the individual for the group as the unit of which civil laws take account."

-
1. Buckle, History of Civilization, Vol. 1, page 509,
 2. Ibid.
 3. Kidd's "Social Evolution," page 56.

In speaking of the close of the mediaeval period and the beginning of the Reformation, Draper says,¹ "If we attempt to isolate the principle that lay at the basis of the wonderful social changes that now took place, we may recognize it without difficulty. Heretofore each man had dedicated his services to his superior-feudal or ecclesiastical; now he had resolved to gather the fruits of his exertions himself. Individualism was becoming predominant; loyalty was declining into a sentiment. Individualism rests on the principle that a man shall be his own master, be free to form his own opinions, and be at liberty to carry his resolves into effect. He, is consequently, ever brought into competition with his fellow-men; his life is a display of energy.

To remove from European life the stagnation of centuries, suddenly to vivify what had become an inert mass, to impart to it individualism was to bring it into conflict with the influences which had oppressed it.

Individualism found its embodiment in a sturdy German monk, and therefore, perhaps necessarily, asserted its rights under theological forms. Martin Luther refused to think

1. "Conflict between Science and Religion, page 295.

as he was ordered to do by his ecclesiastical superiors at Rome; he asserted that he had an inalienable right to interpret the Bible for himself. Rome at first made the mistake of supposing that this was nothing more than a casual outbreak; she failed to discern that it was in fact the culmination of an internal movement which for two centuries had been going on in Europe.

At her first glance, Rome saw nothing in Martin Luther but a vulgar, insubordinate, quarrelsome monk; but as the conflict went on it was discovered that Martin was not standing alone. Many Thousands of men, as resolute as himself, were coming to his support. The long and bloody wars that ensued were closed by the peace of Westphalia; and then it was found that Central and Northern Europe had cast off the intellectual tyranny of Rome, that individualism had triumphed, and had established the right of every man to think for himself."

For more than three centuries Europe was ablaze with the autos da fe', and further reddened by battle-fields, in the vain attempt to stay this individualistic movement. But it had the power of molecular force, and could be neither overcome nor withstood. Our modern world is what the reformation has made it.

The last three centuries have been a constant struggle for individual rights and for political and religious freedom. Judging by results there can be no doubt the rightfulness of the struggle. Those countries in which it has gained most are farthest advanced in every phase of civilization --- life is safest, happiest and most satisfying. The entire movement has been one of cautious experiment.

Every individual gain has been secured in the face of a determined conservation of position.

More than half a century has been given to the suffrage struggle in England, making Burns' well-known sentiment, "A man's a man for a' that, and a' that," a political fact.

Free, public schools are now only fully established, more than three hundred years after Mulcaster's plea. Hereditary right and aristocratic privilege are still strong, social and political factors, but throughout the century personal liberty and individual rights have advanced steadily.

On the Continent less, probably, has been gained; yet much has been won for the cause of popular education, and for civil and political rights.

Not only has Italy been united, but her peasantry are being educated.

Kossuth's crushed Magyars are now the political equals of their Austrian Masters, and the House of Hapsburg rules not Austria, but Austria-Hungary.

France, which a century ago, suffering the throes of her terrible revolution, had just entered upon her Napoleonic delirium, has through the vicissitudes of empire, kingdom, and republic, advanced steadily toward popular government, the enfranchisement of the masses, and the education of all her people.

Germany leads all European countries in her watch over the educational interests of each individual child. Frederick William III expressed the earnest desire, "that the greatest¹ attention be given to the instruction of the people." But here in America, this democratic development has been most marked; here, the individual citizen attains to the greatest freedom. It has been said "America is opportunity." Opportunity has lead to the utmost individual endeavor, and produced the most splendid economic and political results the world has yet known. Within two centuries a few, struggling colonies have united and become one of the great nations of the world; and this, with two-thirds of its area but one generation re-

1. Painter's History of Education, page 292.

moved from frontier life. Billions are spent annually for the public good in which the humblest may share.

It may be claimed that this is not strictly individualism; that it may with better reason be claimed as collectivism in the form of state-control and state-action. Society has acted collectively, but the ultimate source of this action is the individual citizen, who works for individual benefit through the state and through society. Legislation has been individualistic, not communistic, in that it has sought to give all an equal chance.

Wherein it has rejected the doctrine of laissez faire, its object has been to protect the weaker, and give them an equal chance. Its communism has been unconscious and
1
unintentional.

All the traditions of America are individualistic. A popular sentiment exists, that a man to be truly great must be "self-made." Our popular states-men have as a rule "risen from the ranks" by individual effort. Lincoln is more beloved and admired than Washington for this very reason. Lincoln is loved, Washington, venerated.

- - - - -

1. Bryce's American Commonwealth, Vol. II, page 422

Our individualistic traditions are the natural outcome of our earlier conditions, colonial and frontier. The cabin of the early settlers, and of the western emigrants were the antipodes of collectivism.¹

The extreme individualism of the earlier, colonial period or of the far frontier must, of course, pass away with the conditions that produced them, yet not wholly. The American of to-day must to some extent be modified by his ancestral origin. Tradition and custom hold less with us than with foreigners. We are more independent and self-reliant; and less deferential and conventional.

This change is shown in the attitude of the people toward the general government. The dread of the anti-federalists was the centralization of the government; they resented paternalism, and feared collectivism. The national sentiment has so grown and strengthened as to leave no question of its genuineness. This may be less strong, or less fully indorsed in some sections, theoretically, but the sentiment exists in truth.

This sentiment has tended towards similarity; then too our public schools have had a powerful influence in pro-

1. Bryce's American Commonwealth, Vol. II, page 419.

noting this similarity, for despite our not having a national system of education, there has been much in common in our school training. Our schools have tended to unify our people. If our earlier history was too individualistic, there is now a strong tendency in the opposite direction. Paternalism and socialism are apparent in present legislation and in the later state constitutions. Corporate power and organized wealth have come to control a large part of our economic activity. The lessening of individualism politically, economically, or socially is certainly apparent, but whether it be a good is¹ questionable. It is still in the experimental state.

The growth of collectivism is largely unconscious and inevitable. We find more of it in state than in national legislation. Our state legislatures are largely composed of men who know little of theoretic politics; but they are as a rule "practical politicians," with some specific, perhaps personal, purpose in mind, some moral issue to settle, some economic scheme to be attempted.

They do not understand what is meant by leaving these to "natural laws." They are impatient to help nature

- - - - -

1. Bryce's American Commonwealth, Vol. II, Page 425.

if they seek to accomplish a good; and if personal, or corporate aggrandizement is sought they are shrewd enough to know that nature is against them. Much of this legislation is, we believe, of the former kind. The people hope to realize quickly what they deem to be beneficial, and they elect representatives who acting for them, endeavor to accomplish their desires through state-action. That danger lies in this situation is apparent. Self-reliance is weakened; self-effort abandoned. Men cease to act and think each for himself, but do so collectively; in popular parlance, go with the crowd.

The important point becomes, not what is right, but what will win. "God and one are a majority" is either unintelligible to them, or is mere rhetoric.

We are fond of saying that future legislators are now in school, and in the teacher's keeping. Whatever significance this fact may have is directly in point in this discussion.

Whatever of individuality may be impressed upon the children of to-day will of course be found in the men and women of the future.

Our estimate of the importance of this truth will be measured by our belief in the influence of teaching. In a

republic nothing can be of greater import than that men and women should be given high ideals and trained to think and act for themselves. Not trained to perversity of will and selfishness, but to that high-minded manhood which would ^{nobly} win all that it justly may, declining with honest scorn the favors of kings or states.

The "dull monotony" of our American democracy can be relieved, if it be a fact, by the development of the most highly endowed of the rising generation. "Nevertheless, I am inclined to believe that as the intellectual proficiency and speculative play of mind which are now confined to a comparatively small class become more generally diffused, as the pressure of effort towards material success is relaxed, as the number of men devoted to science, art and learning increases, so will the dominance of what may be called the business mind decline, and with a richer variety of knowledge, tastes and pursuits, there will come also a larger crop of marked individualities, and of divergent intellectual types."¹

Here, as elsewhere, the advancement of the whole depends upon the advancement of a favored few whom nature has given power to recast, if not recreate. To find such individu-

1. Bryce's American Commonwealth, Vol. II, page 695.

alities and to give them a chance is a most important part of individualism in teaching.

Flint tells us, "Individualism is an excess as well
¹
 as socialism." We do not deny this. But he also acknowledges, "The slightest survey of history should suffice to convince us that an enormous amount of mischief has been caused by over-legislation, and that human progress has largely consisted in widening the range of individual liberty, and narrowing that of public interference."
²

It is a weakness for the individual to accept what he can do for himself. Necessity is the excuse alone for the acceptance of a gratuity.

There may be good^dethical reasons for state intervention on behalf of the weaker members of the community. Women, children, the less-skilled artizans, and the ordinary laborers may require^sspecial legislation for their defence.

The factory laws of England are an example of this kind of state-socialism; and our own state-laws against the employment of children belong to the same class.

- - - - -

1. "Socialism," Flint, Page 64,
2. "Socialism," Flint, Page 65,

The "laissez faire" doctrine which held undisputed sway a few generations ago has been found to be not entirely true. It is neither in complete individualism nor in pure socialism that the social ideal is to be found; but in a harmonious blending of these. All must work "preferring one another," yet preserving self-respect by self-reliance. "To thine own self be true," and its complement will follow.

A sharp struggle exists at present between socialism and individualism. The governments of Europe are more or less "paternal," and to that extent are socialistic. But as political freedom grows this tends to diminish; not, however, without protest from the socialistic theorist.

The State-Socialism of Germany, the Communism of France, the Agrarianism of Ireland, and the single-tax doctrine of America are present, active systems of collectivism. These doctrines have been carried into politics and are to-day vital issues. They are not, however, entirely socialistic; in method they are collective, in that they seek to gain their ends through the agency of the Government; but the end may be said to be individualistic in that it seeks an extension of liberty and personal rights, economical as well as political. This movement is democratic, and would probably result in in-

dividual advantage.

Herbert Spencer is perhaps the ablest and most pronounced of the present advocates of extreme individualism. The liberty of each, to be limited only by like liberty for all, is his formula; the state is to interfere only so far as to secure this individual liberty. The state, the collective power, is thus to be a negative, rather than a positive force, and is to protect rather than to help the individual. Just what is to be the practical outcome of this contest remains to be seen. If it is to produce a general leveling of society, it will certainly be an evil. For social progress has come through individual differences of betterment. The more richly endowed are to be given the full advantage of their heritage. The one talent that is weakly hidden will be added to the ten, so that the most shall be more, and the least left to perish. That social order can persist which is in accord with the overmastering power that by carefully selected individual units builds up a progressive society.

CHAPTER II.

- - - - -

THE EVILS OF COLLECTIVISM IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

- - - - -

Modern civilization demands universal education; it is claimed for the child as a birthright, and for society as a necessity.

1

The demand has not been fully granted anywhere; and in some countries, which are called civilized, it has scarcely been heeded.² But the tendency is toward the education of the masses.

The government is expected to meet this demand, for the government to-day is justly supposed to be not only of and by the people, but for them.

The government must establish justice, but justice must secure to each his individual birthright; it must insure domestic tranquillity, but ignorance in a democracy ever

- - - - -

1. In the United States where education is widely diffused and amply provided for, there is still a demand for increased opportunities and for special training: country high-schools,, trade-schools, commercial high-schools, public libraries.
2. Russia, Spain,, Portugal,

threatens mob violence; it must provide for the common defence; but free, strong minds, cunning hands, and cultured brains are not only the riches of the commonwealth but also its best defence; it must secure to a worthy posterity the blessings of liberty.

To provide the education thus demanded requires system and administration; but these lead inevitably to collectivism; wherein the individual becomes more and more lost in the mass. This collectivism is not necessarily an evil; but is, within proper bounds, a good. The child, even more than the adult, is social, and companionship is a necessity for proper development. Never has there been a system of education without its schools; and even where formal teaching has been confined to the home, usually there is more than one to be taught, and the advantage of numbers is frequently sought by a union of families.

The relative advantages and disadvantages of the public school over tutorial teaching in the home was quite fully discussed by Richard Mulcaster in "Positions," his celebrated work on teaching, published in 1583. "Education," he

says, "is the bringing up of one not to live alone but amongst
¹others." "Private education partakes of the cloister; pub-
²lic education, of broad fields and open air." Children
 should be known to each other as children, if they are to live
³together as adults." "Private schools are much used," he
 says, "because people of more fortunate or higher positions in
 life desire to train their children to be above those whom they
 consider not their equals." This is a great mistake, for
 just as men learn by intercourse with their fellows, so do
 children.

"The prince himself being one and singular must needs
 embrace the private discipline, and yet, if even the greatest
 could have his training so cast as he might have the company
 of a good choice number wherein to see all differences of
 wills, how to discern of all, which must deal with all were it
⁴any sacrifice?"

These were rather bold words for the days of Eliza-
 beth, yet entirely true. Every man should know his fellows,
 and none needs it more than he who is to rule.

-
- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | Mulcaster, "Positions," | Page 184, |
| 2. | do. do. | 185, |
| 3. | do. do. | 186, |
| 4. | do. do. | 186, |

In Mulcaster's day the great multitude was uneducated; the reverse is true to-day and this changed condition has brought an accompanying evil, not a necessary one, but a really serious one. In the school system the school, the class, the division, or some aggregate of pupils becomes, or tends to become the unit, and thus the individual child fails more or less to receive the special attention required for his best training. This fact is fully attested by school reports, and it is impossible, under existing circumstances, for it to be otherwise. How could a state superintendent so administer his office as to reach the thousands of individual children attending the schools of the state? In the general administration of a system the aggregate only can be provided for. This fact is so apparent that it would be unnecessary formally to state it, were it not that this collectivism incident to the general management is carried down through the system until it becomes the controlling idea in the actual work of teaching. This collectivism dominates the school-room and the teacher fails to realize she has forty individual children under her care, but feels she has forty homogeneous beings; so really homogenous, at least, that they can be provided for on general principles.

The great majority of teachers have never given this subject any serious thought. They find themselves a part of a great system, and are soon lost in it; their pupils are carried with them, and in the school-room begins that "lock-step" march which is to bear them on with that

"Innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm."

where the individual being is indeed lost in the dust of death.

But education has to do with the living, and it is of vital importance to each what his place shall be in the busy mart of life.

1

President Eliot says, "Education is properly the development and training of the individual body, mind and will; but when it is systematized and provided for many thousands of pupils simultaneously, it almost invariably adopts military or mechanical methods, and these methods tend to produce a lock-step and a uniform speech; and result in a drill at word of command rather than in the free development of personal opinion in action. The interests of the individual are frequent-

- - - - -

1. See Address in Proceedings of the National Educational Association of 1892.

ly lost sight of, or rather are served only as the individual can be treated as an average atom in a homogeneous mass. This natural tendency in systems of education I believe to be a great evil, particularly in a democratic society where other influences, governmental, industrial, and social, tend towards averaging the human stock." This is weighty authority, and confirms our view of the evils of collectivism in teaching.

The class is the unit in most schools. The lessons are assigned to the class, and each member is expected to do the same amount of work; it may be more exact to say each is expected to prepare the assigned task, and theoretically is supposed to do so. As a matter of fact we know this to be an impossibility.

In schools where strict discipline prevails there is a serious effort made to have each one go through the form, at least, of completing the general task. Those who fail are felt to be morally culpable. The child is made to feel that he is morally responsible for his intellectual failures. Puritanic strictness based on Calvinistic theory dominates much of our educational work, as harsh educationally as it is theologically, but with less excuse, as the theologian be-

believes in a divine sanction of his theory, while the intelligent teacher knows the error of his position.

All will admit, I believe, that the practice is not based on truth. The individual differences of members of the same class or grade are sufficient to make it unjust to expect equal work from all. It is impossible to secure this uniformity, and the teacher who demands it does so with a mental reservation, knowing it is founded on fiction. It is honestly believed, no doubt, to be necessary fiction, for we cannot tell positively what each pupil can do, and if we require enough we will not be censured for any failure to attain the average standard. Perhaps we may find ourselves doubly censurable, for having required so little of the bright pupils, and for hectoring the weaker ones whom it is safe to drive. This, I believe to be the great, if not unpardonable, pedagogic sin.

Not only is this true of equality of intellectual work, but also of equality of conduct. All members of the school are required theoretically to measure up to the established standard of behavior. But the inherited moral differences in children and their different environments are quite as decided as their intellectual differences.

The injustice of this moral requirement is more sharply felt, and is productive of greater difficulties than the demand for intellectual uniformity. Moral short-comings are treated with greater severity than intellectual failures. The "bad boy" is the school criminal; and the criminal code as administered by many teachers has few and slight mitigations. We make no plea for the really, vicious child. It should be at once removed from all intercourse with its better fellows; but when the difficulty arises from the inability of the individual to conform to the conventional morality of the school-room, there should be some adjustment of the general plan to avoid injustice to the particular child. An exact adjustment of rights and duties is impossible, but each has rights which the many ought not infringe or deny.

The injustice that seems incident to school government is not to be charged alone to the teacher.

The public demands discipline in the school, and is equally imperative for impartiality. These often become the horns of a dilemma. Nothing gives conscientious teacher more trouble than trying to make just allowance for the delinquent individual and at the same time satisfying the public demand that all be treated alike.

The teachers are part of the community and to a great extent see things as it does; hence, they concur in this demand, and it comes to be unquestioned that the pupil should do what the system requires; it follows as a corollary that each is morally culpable in case of failure.

This is certainly a cast-iron formula, subject to the defect which threatens all castings, namely, an imperfect mould.

There certainly is a necessity for recasting this formula, or better still, having one wrought which may prove more flexible, and thus better suited to the manifold, varying cases to which it must be applied.

Our systems of education are so perfectly adjusted and so unquestionably accepted, that it would require caution to make any radical changes. Local law giving uniformity of organization, and the minutely specific syllabus giving uniformity to subject-matter and method have modelled our schools into cadet-corps, keeping the "average step" which insures the sameness sought by the exacting drill-master.

This uniformity is unnatural; when the boys and girls leave school and emerge upon life's high-road, the step is soon lost, each walking his own gait as soldiers on a long

march; the exact step-keeping is for dress parade, and I fear much of our educational lock-step is for the same purpose.

This failure to keep together after leaving school is the more significant because of the uniformity of the training. The natural differences must be great and absolute else this enforced sameness of school-life would be the dominant factor and change the whole life; but this we see is not true; and since it is an accepted truth that we work with, not against nature, in the accomplishment of our educational ends is it not well carefully to consider present plans?

The unnaturalness of the prevailing method is further shown by the protest which children make against school-life, and the eagerness with which a majority leave school. It is claimed that this aversion to school has been greatly lessened by adopting a more individualistic method.

Instinct and common sense have, unconsciously perhaps, adopted this more natural system of teaching, where wealth or influence has permitted .

The wealthy have always sought to give their children what they believed to be the superior advantage of special and specific help. That more has often been lost than gained by going to the exclusive extreme does not invalidate

the argument for the value to the individual. They realized the need of individual help for their children, but did not consider the need of companionship of other children of like age. This is only another illustration of the blinding effects of pride, and argues against exclusively individualistic teaching alone. This is Mulcaster's argument for the public school.

Our present system is not economical. Those who cannot "keep up" with the class must go back and thus lose time. The extent of this loss will depend upon the amount of the course already finished. The time-loss is not the only one; the consequent discouragement and humiliation of the pupil is, perhaps, the greater loss; how great we cannot tell for ~~the~~ things of the spirit cannot be weighed. Experience shows that even the dullest pupils are not, as a rule, indifferent to demotion. The bright pupils are held back, and lose in the opposite direction. Not being required to make due effort these pupils are tempted to fatal indifference and great loss of power. They float along easily, and scarcely come to know what real school-work means. This loss is greater than the failure to gain the extra knowledge and mental discipline that might have been wrought by earnest and sustained effort.

The evils of school-collectivism are not confined to the pupils. The teacher is subject also to serious loss in not working along the line of least resistance: unnatural forcing and unnatural restraint follow. There is thus seen to be a loss to the teaching power of the school, as well as to the two classes, the dull and the bright pupils. This manifold loss is one of Nature's ways of indicating a mistake. Wastefulness is incident to every error, which is thereby corrected or destroyed. Wastefulness can never successfully compete with economy; it is doomed by the very nature of things to final failure.

There is, still further, a subjective loss on the part of the teacher. One of the severest criticisms against the average teacher of the elementary school is the tendency to machine-work, to automatism. If this be as general as is claimed, there must be cause for it. The teachers are not recruited from the dullards in our training-schools and colleges; the reverse is true. I do not say the brightest have sought the teaching profession, but certainly the brighter ones are more attracted to it; teaching is assumed to be an intellectual calling.

Why, then, this deterioration? Is it due to the

mental monotony of school-work? The subject matter is the same -- truth and fact remain constant, -- if we now assume the pupils to remain constant, there follows a sameness that necessarily threatens, and usually produces mental stagnation. We do assume this pupil-sameness in the prepared syllabus, which assigns so much in each subject, for each grade, for each term. Cannot this be corrected? The invariableness of truth and fact -- the matter to be taught -- is not an assumption; but there is great variability in children; and accepting this as a determining factor in teaching, it will give in lieu of text-book monotony, an ever varying panorama of "the stream of thought."

None will deny a sufficient likeness for the basis of a true classification. The grade is not a mere conventionality, a device of school-economy; but is a correct mode of reaching a necessary system. The error lies in not recognizing the real diversity and providing for it. This is the point of departure for individualism in teaching. The teacher may find infinite variety if she look to the individual difference of her pupils and to the differentials in their rates and modes of development. Such a plan cannot fail to arouse interest in the teacher and the sympathy so essential

to a proper relation between teacher and pupil.

System in educational work is not to be condemned; it is not only a necessity, but a positive good. To discard all system, and put in its place a go-as-you-please plan would be greatly to err. Chaos is of night and error;

"Night
And chaos, ancestors of Nature, hold
Eternal anarchy."

The thought of the race is in its systems and institutions. In one sense, "Whatever is, is right," is true. That it is, is right, but it may not follow that it should continue. Society is not static, but dynamic.

It is intended that our graded schools, which are collectivism in the concrete, should yield the greatest good to the greatest number in the shortest time, but we challenge this statement.

May we not increase the total good done by giving more to each, increase the number by losing none in the mass, and shorten the time by holding none back; thus doubly gaining, by giving to the teacher a better method and to the pupil an increased opportunity.

CHAPTER III .

EDUCATIONAL THEORY IS INDIVIDUALISTIC.

All educational theories are based on the education of the one. The nation, the state, the community are to be educated, but the formulation is always in terms of the one.

All definitions of Education are equally individualistic. Even when not explicitly so stated the pronoun employed is in the singular. When children or men are spoken of in connection with education the appropriate plurals are used, but even here the underlying idea is of the individual.¹ Herbert Spencer says, "Society is made up of individuals; all that is done in society is done by the combined actions of individuals; and therefore, in individual actions only can be found the solutions of social phenomena." J. A. Langford states, "Education is the perfecting of the whole by the previous perfection of the individual."

1. "Education and Educators," Kay, Chap. I.

"Whatever advances civilization can do so through individuals; the existence and labor of every one of whom affects the total results." ¹ Plato saw, in the state, only "the individual writ large," but this gave but the end of education. It was to be accomplished only through individual training. All education and training were to be for the benefit of the state, but still it was the individual child who was to be educated and trained.

"Education," Rosenkranz tells us, "is the conscious influence of one will upon another so as to produce in it conformity to an ideal which it sets before it." ² "In a more restricted sense we mean by education the shaping of the individual life by the laws of nature, the rhythm of national customs, and the might of destiny." ³ The individuality of the pupil and special conditions determine the particular form of the education to be given each.

The freedom of the pupil is the ultimate end to be kept in view; i. e. ultimate freedom through proper training.

- - - - -

1. Education and Educators, Kay, Page 7,
2. Philosophy of Education, Page 10,
3. Ibid, Pages 21, 24 and 36.

It is unnecessary, I presume, to multiply quotations, for the title of this chapter will scarcely be questioned.

The individual child then, is assumed as the unit in educational theory; but it is a theoretic, average child -- an abstraction, or a mere approximation. Just what the average child is cannot be definitely known until there is a more exact and scientific testing and analysis of all children.

The induction necessary to establish just what the average child is has not been made. Of course, experience has given us a "rough estimate" which is our practical standard.

The marking system, both in class and in examination does give an approximation to average ability. It is however so liable to error, so inaccurate and frequently so unscientific a basis that its results have little real value; the recitation, not the pupil, is usually marked.

Class marks and examination results cannot, therefore, be made the basis of an exact classification of pupils.

Age is considered in making our classifications, but this is really only a disturbing element when used in connection with the "marks."

Time in school is a very common basis of classifica-

tion. Practically we speak of the first and the second year in school in connection with all our courses of study.

Our syllabi are prepared on this basis; it seems to be the dominant factor in classification from the kindergarten to the University. Basing our work on this time element assumes practical equality of work on the part of the pupil. But this equality does not exist. Our theory has had a pupil in imagination, but it is not the real pupil; the one that everywhere makes havoc of our theorizing. The pupil, whom in theory, we teach is not the one whom in practice we meet.

Our theory is individualistic; our practice is collective; and we teach this group as though it were correctly represented by the theoretic, average pupil.

Pedagogy is largely dependent, theoretically, on those sciences which relate to man. Psychology, Ethics, Sociology, Economics, Politics, and Theology stand in close relation to the science of teaching; and, in so far as they are individualistic, they tend to make pedagogy the same.

The truths of psychology are of course general; they relate to the human mind; but herein is included all individual minds, by having what is common to them all. To be

entirely true it must be an induction from the facts of each and every human mind. To be scientifically true the induction must be so complete as to account for all individual, mental facts and phenomena. Psychology, then, is to be regarded as an inductive science.

When we connect psychology and pedagogy we must apply these general truths to individual minds. Psychology furnishes the teacher with the major premises. He must furnish the minor, and draw the conclusion. Psychology furnishes the classified description -- the teacher must observe the individual mind and know where to class it in like manner as the botanist does in his field-work. The psychologist generalizes; the teacher individualizes. Not only should he individualize, but also specify as to the different periods in the individual child-life; and still further note its varying moods and its departures from the normal type. This will require a noting far different from that followed in the ordinary "marking system." It will obligate a previous knowledge of mental science, an intelligent application of its truths, and a keen observation of the mental process going on. The marking regime calls for only a squinting of the eye and the leaning of the ear toward the recited text and the pupil.

Themaster with his finger on the line, his ear on the pupil and his eyes on the school is this method in the concrete.

The fact that some of our psychological theories are perhaps only tentative, some currently accepted dicta positively denied, does not invalidate the claim that psychology is a corner-stone in educational theory. Further introspection of self and more extended observation of others will either fully establish these disputed points or replace them with truer ones.

Educational theory holds that what a child is determines largely what he is to be. Future growth and development depend largely on present conditions. But how can a teacher know what a pupil is except by careful and intelligent observation; once establish this in practice as it now exists in theory, and the dullard will no longer be censured for his deficiencies. An individualistic scheme must provide a knowledge not only of what the pupil is, but must keep an accurate record of his mental and physical gain or loss. Our theory demands this and our scheme must provide for it as far as possible.

Under existing conditions this exact record is unattainable, as perfection in any system cannot be compassed, yet,

need not on this account be rejected. An individualistic scheme has been shown to lie at the basis of every theory of education. Individualism only seeks to emphasize, explicitly or implicitly, what is thus admitted in theory.

The close relation between ethics and pedagogy is now generally admitted. In theory, at least, character is made the true end of education. Mere memory cram and intellectual athletics may still win the prizes, for practice usually lags behind theory.

The Sophists are still with us -- a trick of words, the verbal jugglery in the twist of a sentence may bring applause, but

"Merit wins the soul."

Ethics is individualistic, in that it is the individual, not man in the aggregate, who is to know and do the right. Sidgwick says, "I prefer to consider Ethics as the science or study of what is right or what ought to be, so far as this depends upon the voluntary actions of individuals."¹

"Ethics aims at determining what ought to be done by individuals."²

1. Sidgwick, Page 4.
2. Ibid, Page 15.

If universal happiness be accepted as the ultimate ethical end, still it is the individual that is so to live that he may most fully contribute to this general happiness.

Even when the ought is placed on society the individual members are to be trained to see that the whole performs the duties devolving upon the parts. Intuitionism makes the individual conscience the basis of its system. It may acknowledge the divine sanction but this is binding on the individual conscience. In so far, then, as Ethics influences educational theory it will be individualistic.

Sociology is the science of society, yet it makes the individual the unit and all its cultural associations are concerned immediately with the individual. Letourneau tells us, "Social evolution has made the ethical group larger and larger; and the tendency seems to be to make the whole world a connected whole and yet we have made for ourselves an individual independence always increasing and limited only by the real interests of the community."

Notwithstanding the widening of the social circle by evolution, still the individual freedom is limited only by the greater right of all the others. If the interests between individual and social well-being conflict, the former

must yield. Is it not probable that a fuller development of this science will disclose the truth that a perfect correlation lies between the general welfare and the highest personal good?

We find in Gidding, "The supreme end of Society in general is the protection and perfection of the sentient life. The end of human society is the development of the rational¹ and spiritual personality of its members." "Only the cultural associations are immediately concerned in this function. Educational institutions, religious, scientific, ethical and aesthetic organizations, and polite society act for good or ill directly upon the individual. The individual is the social unit."² "So far as volitional association has to be accounted for by a "raison d' etre" it has a complete explanation in its reactions upon the ethical and mental phases of individual life. Volitional association is functional in maintaining the conditions necessary to the highest personal evolution."

Thus Gidding certainly concedes the individualistis basis of sociology. It is the function of society to main-

- - - - -

1. Gidding, Page 195
2. Ibid, Page 399.

tain those conditions necessary to the highest development of each personality.

Educational systems, which stand at the head of all "cultural associations," must, in so far as they are directed by the principles of sociology, of necessity be individualistic. Economics makes clear the distinction between "subjective and objective" values. The Austrian school and its large and influential following make "subjective value" the central idea of their system. But "subjective value" is the importance which a good is considered to possess with reference to the
1
well-being of a person."

Education and Economics meet, then on the common ground of subjective conditions. Individual wants determine Economic activity; and enable the economist to define value.

Politics is not so individualistic as the sciences just mentioned. Indeed it may appear to be wholly of the state ; of men in their national totality; but a moment's reflection will make clear that even in this science the individual citizen is most important.

Especially is this true in a democracy where each

- - - - -

voter is a sovereign citizen. The ideal is for every one to know his duty,

"And knowing, dare maintain."

Politics, then, asks pedagogy to prepare each child for citizenship; -- to prepare the one that he may fittingly take his place in that greater unity, -- his country. What is here spent is in truth profitably spent. Maclaren strikes at the root, when in "Beside the Bonnie Brier Bush" he rouse^d in Domsie the appeal, "Gin ye hed the heart to spend it on a lad o' pairts like Geordie Hoo, ye wud hae twa rewards nae man could tak fra ye. Ane wud be the honest gratitude o' a laddie whose desire for knowledge ye hed sateesfied, and the second wud be this -- anither scholar in the land; and a'm thinking with auld John Knox that ilka scholar is something added to the commonwealth."

Theology of every type, from the most orthodox conservatism to the most heterodox liberalism makes each human being personally responsible to his Creator.

Even that church which seeks to liken the "Kingdom of God" to a temporal one, making its supreme head absolute in its infallibility and denying its subjects all right of private judgment in things ecclesiastical demands the most

exacting and exclusive schooling of its children. The school must do more than supplement the church; it must be part of it. Not only is the teacher to be of ~~the~~ its faith, but to bear the insignia of order. Education is deemed essential, even though "ignoarance is the mother of devotion."

At all times, in every denomination, the school has followed the church. If religion, then, be for the individual so must the training that prepares for it. "My son, give me thine heart," is the divine call. The child must know the voice, and understand its injunctions.

Since all the formal statements of pedagogical theory are both explicitly and implicitly individualistic; and all the sciences treating of man are more or less the same, is it not fair to affirm without qualification that the practice of teaching should, as far as possible, likewise be individualistic?

All high art has principles to which it is consistent. Should not the highest of arts be equally true to its conditioning science; -- the art that essays not to copy in lifeless matter the human form divine, but to mould and fathom the soul itself?

CHAPTER IV.

APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUALISM TO PEDAGOGY.

Individualism in education may be defined as the adaptation of education both in matter and method to the needs of each individual, or to his special capabilities.

The first requisite, then, for individualistic teaching is a full and accurate knowledge, mentally and physically, of each pupil; not only must this be had, but it must be distinctly and explicitly recorded. First, "The teacher finds himself confronted with a number of individual minds, each of which has its own peculiar pattern or make. The work of instructing these minds is at every point conditioned by these peculiarities. Thus, the differences among children in respect to their way of attending, as seen in the contrast between the persistent, concentrative, and the 'flighty' mind, must it is evident, serve to modify the method of instruction. Hence, the teacher requires all the knowledge that psychology can supply respecting the modes of variation among minds.

A truly scientific method of comparing and measuring individual minds forms, indeed, one of the desiderata of our theories of education." ¹ The second step is an exact noting of the development of the individual child, to be also recorded with equal care; and the third, to know the educational subject-matter best suited to these different individual peculiarities, whether native or developed; and the best method of presenting this content of education, that the maximum of knowledge and training may be attained.

We wish to know what the child is when he enters school, and to add or subtract as his growth and development may require. In practice this can be only approximated; difficult, physically, to make such statement full and accurate, it would be impossible, mentally. At present no such scheme is generally accepted even in theory, and were one formulated it would require an indefinite period to perfect it in practice.

"The problem of determining and formulating the several modes of variation of mental development is a subject which has hardly begun to be seriously grappled with. The

- - - - -

1. Sully, "Outlines of Psychology," Page 503,

innumerable varieties of individual character among civilized men appear indeed to defy any attempt at scientific analysis¹ and classification."

This plan would, of course, presuppose a more or less accurately conceived typical mind with which to compare the individual variations. The typical mind would of necessity be modified from time to time by the accumulated knowledge of particular minds. The reflex effect of individual, psychological observation is, I believe, a most important point, but will be seen to have been treated elsewhere.

When first the child enters school, an accurate entry, as far as may be, should be made, describing him physically and mentally; stating age, height, weight, build, complexion and physiognomy; general health noted, cranial and chest measurements made, and such others as are necessary for important physical proportions. The senses of sight, hearing and touch should be tested to determine their power and hygienic condition.

Most difficult of all, mental alertness must be estimated, intensity and tenacity of attention, quickness of

- - - - -

1. Sully, "Outlines of Psychology," Page 489.

perception, strength of memory, vividness of imagination, power to judge, ability to express thought, capacity and refinement of feeling. All of which is easy to prescribe, but most difficult to follow; yet it is not impossible, for much of it has been approximated."

The value of this analysis is attested by the truism that the teacher should know his pupil, by the wide-spread interest in "child-study," and by the efforts of our physiological psychologists to have the results of their researches and experiments applied in the school-room.

The sub-committee (of the celebrated committee of fifteen) on the training of teachers report as follows:

"Modern educational thought emphasizes the opinion that the child, not the subject of study, is the guide to the teacher's effort. To know the child is of paramount importance. How to know the child must be an important item of interest to these teachers in training.

The child must be studied as to his physical, mental, and moral condition. Is he in good health? Are his senses of sight and hearing normal? What is his temperament? Which of his faculties are weak or dormant? Is he eye-minded or



ear-minded? What are his powers of attention? What are his likes and dislikes? By what test can the degree of differences between bright and dull children be estimated? To study effectively and observingly these and similar questions respecting children is a high art. No common-sense power of discerning human nature is sufficient, though common-sense and sympathy go a long way in such study. 'Some of this work they say belongs to the psychological laboratory rather than to the school-room,' "but add, "Above all it must be remembered that the child is to be studied as a personality, and not simply as an object to be analyzed and weighed."

What has been thus far stated is only preliminary, for it gives merely a scientific description of the child as he is, and is pedagogically valuable simply as a basis and guide for scientific teaching. We are to train the child as these personal facts and correct pedagogical theories dictate. When such a scheme is fully developed all the sciences that relate to man will indeed be brought into close, practical touch with pedagogy; and pedagogy itself will have the prophetic power which is the supreme test of scientific worth.

For knowing what the child is and what education may be expected to do, the probable end, barring accident, may

be foretold.

If this individualistic plan is ever to be practically applied it must be systematized. This properly done, we believe it can be carried out with much less labor than at first thought may seem necessary.

All pupils now entering our city schools are registered. Name, age, residence, nationality, and parents' name and occupation are all recorded, with further details as to former schooling, if any, grade, whether vaccinated, and time of transfer. At present this enumeration closes the child's record; if our individualistic plan were adopted, to this statement would be added the further description just proposed all of which could be recorded in tabular form. It would be necessary, further, to keep this record open for the future history of the child. This is now done to some extent in the examination and promotion record designed to show the child's progress in his studies; and has whatever value may attach to such percentage. That it is quite low is admitted, we believe, by all who have intelligently considered our present schemes of examinations and promotions.

At stated times the physical facts concerning the child would be noted, as before enumerated, to know its physi-

cal growth and development. How often this should be done would be determined by experience -- annually at least.

The mental facts would require equal, if not greater, attention than the physical, though the relative importance of these would vary with the age and development of the child.

How this is to be done cannot be definitely and dogmatically stated, for we know of no such scheme having been practiced for any considerable time, i. e. long enough for it to claim to be established. Several different attempts have been made.

The public schools of Elizabeth, New Jersey, are now giving the individualistic plan a trial. In the "Atlantic Monthly" for June, 1897, Supt. Shearer writes of the development of the work. They have no "promotion-examinations. Recitations and tests are made the basis instead; requiring careful attention to the daily work of each child. Promotion can be made whenever a probability is shown of ability to do the work of the next higher grade. This is a systematic plan for irregular advancement within the school."

Mr. Shearer says, "Their records show that there are certain danger points where individual instruction is

greatly needed. This system provides systematically for such instruction." The work it is found can best be done by having the classes small; he recommends from eight to twenty. This individualistic plan, he states, is a complete success in Elizabeth, and has produced surprisingly excellent results. One of his most important statements is, "The lazy and troublesome pupil has been almost eliminated, for each has been so placed that he can work, and he does work." The pernicious yet common fault-finding toward this class of pupils is thus over-come. The impossible lock-step is broken. Each division moves at a rate suited to its capacity. Pupils are not driven through a course of study. There is also equal gain in the opposite direction we are told; for it has greatly increased the percentage of attendance, particularly in the higher schools. This comes from the opportunity to give the brighter pupils every advantage to go ahead as rapidly as they are fitted. The gain in time thus effected by the brighter pupils is a financial one to the community.

Mr. Shearer calculates that millions would thus be saved. If correct, this would aid in defraying the expense of the additional teacher which the smaller classes would necessitate. This feature is, of course problematical, and of

secondary importance. What is best for the children is least expensive to the community.

Chicago has had this plan in operation for some years, where it is highly satisfactory. ¹ Dr. Harris, as this report shows, strongly recommended these irregular ^{1st} promotions. Supt. Sabin tells us in this report, "This plan of promotion of pupils whenever a class has satisfactorily completed the work of a grade draws a sharp line between the work of a successful teacher as compared with the work of an ordinary one. -- This flexible system puts a bounty on the work of the good teacher."

"Twenty-three per cent of the pupils," says Mr. Shearer, "earned an irregular, advanced promotion." The good is not felt by these bright pupils alone, all the others are stimulated by it. The dull ones strive not to be left so far behind," as also not to be overtaken by those below. Here the impulse to effort comes from within, is subjective. Interested effort on the part of each pupil is the ideal mainspring of school-room activity. It is interested effort which has led so many men to self-education; such being the utmost extreme of individual teaching would not an-

1. Report of National Educational Association, 1892, p. 802.

swer as a system of education. It has a value, however, to be utilized by a proper adjustment of classes. If two, or perhaps three, classes or grades are under one teacher, while one class is reciting the other can study, and will, if so trained. This is the usual plan of the ungraded country school. Some of the older pupils in such schools spend much of the school session in study. This is, I believe, the secret cause of their power, so much commended in all the discussions on this subject. It has been facetiously remarked, "study is a lost art in our city schools." The cause, we think, is evident. There is no time for quiet, individual study; the pupils are either reciting or being taught, and are constantly under ^{the} eye of the teacher. Theoretically, our children are under close surveillance from the opening of school until its close. Such complete objective control prevents any genuine subjective direction. This individualistic plan aims to interest the children, give them a chance, and let them be responsible for results.

An individualistic scheme was also tried in Pueblo, Colorado, and was known as the "Pueblo plan." Its author, Supt. P. W. Search, wrote of it in the "Educational Review,"

1. Educational Review, Feb. 1894, p. 154.

He says, "The fundamental characteristic of the plan on which the schools are organized is its conservation of the individual. The pupil works as an individual, progresses as an individual, is promoted as an individual, and is graduated as an individual. The whole system is one of flexibility. The school is graded so far as applies to its plan of work, ungraded in its accommodation of the individual. The entire time of the pupil is spent in advance work. Every room is a true studio or work-shop, in which the pupils work as individuals. There is no attempt to keep pupils together in work. Each individual actually and absolutely recites every chapter and line of his Latin, every section of his other studies, and passes his examination in the most thorough manner. In physical culture the greatest care is exercised to provide perfectly for the symmetrically developed individual. The music is taught collectively, but special training is given to those who specially need it, or to those who are specially gifted." In favor of the plan briefly sketched, the paper claims the following six points:

1. More healthful, because suited to each;
2. Independence and self-reliance secured;
3. More and better work secured;
4. More enthusiasm;
5. Less discouragement;
6. More time for outside work.

Mr. Search adds, "This method of work calls for strong teachers." The paper claims entire satisfaction to have been given by this system.

That it would demand more power on the part of the teacher is evident from the fact that the teacher must not only think, but must know how to lead the child to think.

Mental activity is essential in the teacher if it is to be awakened in the pupil. The teacher who sits with open book to know that the lesson has been committed can never give mental stimulus to a pupil .

The plan seems an extreme one, as each pupil is required not only to prepare each and every point in a lesson, but must also recite it. Again, no class recitations permitted except in music, is, I believe, a mistake.. There is an inspiration in class-work done before the school. Black-board explanation and demonstration, the recital of an inspiring topic in history or of a gem in literature, has especial value in the presence of the class.

The public reports of these two systems of individualistic teaching are given somewhat in detail; not that either is deemed a true embodiment of the system, but because each has attracted general attention, and because their success gives

proof that such a plan is practicable. Individualistic teaching is, to some extent, done every where, precisely the best scheme may not readily be determined. The important point is a recognition of the principle and an attempt made to put it into practice, affording an opportunity for the "survival of the fittest."

I find that a school in Pittsburg, (the Mt. Washington) has done some commendable individualistic work. Definite accounts are prepared, with great care, by the teachers of each pupil under instruction. These reports are made quarterly to the principal. Quoting from one of these individual reports, " ----- entered school in September, never having attended school previous to that time. He is doing very nicely; is attentive and industrious; perceives readily, and has a good memory. His written expression is poor, but is improving; he will be encouraged by advancement."

" ----- has been in the room since September. She is of a lethargic temperament. She is listless and inattentive; her perceptive and retentive faculties are both weak, and she has a decided aversion to work. She is not ready for promotion."

I believe this work could be largely tabulated, and

thus save much time.

So far as I know, none of these schemes of individualistic teaching has been long enough in operation to warrant their acceptance as the best and final form. But this is secondary; the principle once accepted, practice will determine best plans for its realization.

Individualistic teaching will require a greater number of teachers than the present system. Twenty-five or thirty pupils should be the maximum number to one teacher. This increase in the teaching force could be met by auxiliary teachers, and by a judicious use of pupil-assistants. By auxiliary teachers I mean those who are beginning; such teachers should serve an apprenticeship; they should assist and work under the direction of the regular teacher. To have young teachers begin their work under the direction of one who is experienced is important. The inexperienced teacher is everywhere regarded as a positive loss to the pupil.

Millions are spent in ~~the~~ normal-school training in the endeavor to overcome this difficulty; but even this does not afford the practice essential to the mastery of the art of teaching. The auxiliary teacher would be a financial gain to the state, an advantage to the pupil, and a just recognition that some special training is requisite to full standing

in the profession.

Much of the detail of the actual inspection of the pupil's work could be done by pupil-assistants. Individual help, under necessary restriction, could be given by the more advanced pupils. Copying exact forms, spelling, performing correctly the fundamental operations in arithmetic, and all work of this kind would offer opportunities for such assistance.

Under careful adjustment there are possibilities in it not at first seen.

In "Education and Schools," Thring says, "Too few teachers affect the moral even more than the intellectual progress of pupils. This leads to school antagonisms and these are fatal."¹ A teacher having more pupils than can be properly taught and managed, is under the necessity of using repressive measures to maintain discipline; hence, "school-antagonisms."

"Plenty of occupation, says Thring, "mental and bodily, is the one practical secret of a good school. And the most important condition without which plenty of occupation

1. Thring, "Education and Schools." p. 139.

cannot exist, is that there shall be plenty of masters. A considerable experience has shown that an average of about twenty-five boys to each classical master is as much as can be well managed, taking the whole school through, and must form one class, be employed on the same books, and be the sole charge of that master. It has yet to be proved that one man can teach many classes with advantage. With this number he is able also to make himself acquainted with powers and attainments of every boy under him.." The conditions here stated are certainly not more onerous than those of our public schools. Hence, twenty-five would be approved in them also as the maximum number.

We wish, however, to avoid an extreme individualism. Garfield's conception of a university, wherein Mark Hopkins was the faculty and himself the only student, was such an extreme; yet we realize that the illustration concretes an important truth; viz., that a great personality is the supremepower in teaching; and that this power must act directly on the individual pupil. In the "Bonnie Brier Bush", Domsie's school illustrates this forcibly. The "lads of pairts " were anxiously sought and provided for. It was an ideal country school .

Even under existing conditions teaching could be made much more individual than it now is. The plan of the promotion of pupils at irregular periods on the recommendation of the teacher rather than by examination is based on individualism. But this good can be wholly modified by the teacher pursuing the old, collective method until the end of the term, and then having an examination of her own on which to base her recommendation.

How difficult it is to many teachers to give a specific statement in regard to a pupil who has been in charge for a full term, or perhaps a year. This lack of positive opinion on the part of the teacher comes from want of definite knowledge of the pupil; also from accustomed dependence upon the regular examination. The "system" tends to make the majority of teachers dependent and automatic.

Much of the "keeping in" for lessons now so prevalent in city schools is a vicious use of the individualistic method. It is efficient, however, and "produces results." Pupils who have failed in lessons remain after school is dismissed to rectify the unsatisfactory work. One hour per day, I doubt not, is thus added to the time in school. That this extreme detention is a school-room evil is admitted, but it

is one of the necessary results of rating a teacher by the percentage of her promotions. Its success is proof of its power, not of its merit. Individual help should be given, but at the proper time, under proper conditions. Much of this forcing work has no lasting educational value, even in instruction; what is thus gained is soon forgotten. This practice has come, doubtless empirically, but empiricism is often wrong. Our theory, too, is largely at fault. We assume that all the children in the grade ought to do the required work; and that if teacher and pupil do their duty it will be done. Parents accept this, and knowing the weakness of childhood put the burden of the duty on the teacher. Each periodical promotion season brings the inevitable clash between a false theory and the practice that fails to confirm it.

The detailed child-study which is now so prominent in advanced educational work is perhaps more psychological than pedagogical; yet its ultimate, if not chief, value will be its help to pedagogy. This will be especially true when the work is done by a teacher. Some of these plans for child-

1

study are quite elaborate. They may have special value for the student teacher in leading him to know how and what to observe; also, how to tabulate the same; but require too much time for the regular teacher with the usual number of pupils.

We would not condemn elaborate schemes of child-study. There must be much "dead-work" in every laboratory; much observation to find and confirm one vital fact, and but one in a thousand of the questing voyagers on the ocean of knowledge discover new truths.

Our system even under existing conditions could be made more individualistic. All pupils in a division or in a school could be placed in three general classes; viz., above average, average, and below average, and designated by +, a, —. These general classes could be subdivided as time and specific information might permit; with appropriate symbols used to note them. The school-register or roll-book will provide columns for each branch of study pursued by the pupils, for conduct, etc., and in these the

1. "Child-study Record," by Dr. Noss, Cal. Pa., is of this class. It contains twenty pages, one-half of which are blank forms to be filled.

proper entries would be made. Each pupil's record should follow him from grade to grade. Blank spaces should be provided for desirable, new entries. A space for remarks should be provided with sufficient margin for special statements.

This is indeed a meagre scheme and one that would require less time than the well-worn marking system, noting each recitation. It is proposed as having some value despite its meagreness; and because it can be expanded to include all that is necessary to a complete record of individualistic work. Let the dittos in such a record remain unwritten; and let well-enough alone. That is if the bright pupils continue interested, the average pupils hold their own, and the dull ones make commendable effort, be content. Make gains if proper methods permit, but let there be no feverish straining after results. The details of the record have importance, but how noted is not essential. The one thing of importance is that the teacher must know the pupil individually and be governed by this knowledge.

CHAPTER V.

THE IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUALISM IN TEACHING.

The trend of the world is toward popular democracy,
¹
 and popular democracy tends to individualism.

Sociology refuses to recognize as ultimate class distinctions and hereditary castes but finds the true growth and development of society in the free movement of the individual
²
 units of the social organism. The church preaches the spiritual equality of man before his Maker; it gives to each soul such infinite value as to over-balance the whole material universe. Psychology, through philosophy, finds in mind if not the cause, the reason for matter; but mind to the educator is a concrete entity to be trained to the utmost towards its high destiny.

Political economy now finds its culmination as well as its fundamental law in the economic wants of its social

1. Davidson's Aristotle, Page 10.
2. Kidd's Social Evolution, Page 36.

¹
units. Practical ethics, however the theoretical may divide, now as of old has but one imperative finger with which to make doubly sure its placing of personal responsibility. "Thou art the man," is the ethical, as well as the divine edict.

Evolution shows us the human race slowly changing through the degrees of infinite graduation which are found in individual deterioration or development.² The philosophy of education seeks to know these individual tendencies that it may stay the former, and intelligently aid and direct the latter.

When education fully attains to this it will have passed successfully the crucial test of scientific prophecy. It will then have not only the gift of knowledge but that diviner "power that works for righteousness." Such is the importance of individualism in all that relates to man; of supreme importance, therefore, in education.

Pedagogy acknowledges its obligation to psychology, and chapter III reveals how psychology tends to make pedagogic theory individualistic. We are now to show the converse

1. Clark's Phil. of Wealth, Page 40.
2. Kidd's Social Evolution, Page 351.

of this by establishing the fact that proper individualistic teaching will furnish psychological facts that will greatly aid in gaining a correct and comprehensive, if not complete, induction of mental phenomena in childhood, youth, and adolescence. This work can properly be called practical and scientific "child-study". The first duty of the teacher will be to know as fully as possible each child under her care; physically, mentally, and morally; its antecedents, and its home environments; its companions and play-fellows. Everything that has helped to make him what he is, or may influence his present development - the factors that are to determine what he is to be. It will be apparent that the teacher is best fitted to make these observations. Others may make special studies in experimental psychology; and do work perhaps impossible to the teacher. Parents if capable, can materially assist the teacher; but the teacher's opportunity is equal, at least, to either of these.

As the scientist in any field of knowledge must observe carefully and intelligently, note fully and accurately, and systematize logically, as far as may be, the facts that come under his observation, so must the teacher observe,

note and systematize the facts of mind daily disclosed.

Upon the ability and sincerity with which the work is done will depend its value. There must be the "colorless eye of science," the mind void of refractive prejudice, and a conscience steadfast to truth, if results of value are to be gained. This done, certainly a comprehensive knowledge of child-mind phenomena will be made possible.

What gain this would be to the science of mind can now, perhaps, only be conjectured; but it must, of necessity, produce for the theorist a vast array of facts either to explain present theories, or to form the basis of the "new psychology." That psychology needs this garnering of fact seems evident from the wide-spread demand among leading psychologists for just such work. To them belongs the task to devise and formulate a plan to systematize this work of the teacher that it may not lose its worth because of its unwieldy magnitude. If wisely planned and carefully adjusted to existing school-room conditions these "field-notes" of intelligent teachers could not fail to be of permanent value.

Thus would the psychological thinkers have ten-thousand eyes and ears alert to see and hear for them. Then, too, what ample checks on errors of observation; for these observers could not all agree in their errors, but agreement could be accounted for only by the unity of truth.

But there is another and a greater value in this work,- a multiplying of its importance; and this through its reflex value to the teacher. Teachers who are to do this work must be trained for it. "Child-study" in the school-room is not to be a "fad", but a systematized investigation-ultimately with some scientific research. Child-study has already turned attention to the child rather than to the content of education. Empiricism is surely a mild term for much of the knowledge teachers now have of the development of mind. The scheme would necessitate a working knowledge of psychology akin to the theory upon which the botanist bases his field-work. Appreciation would call for previous knowledge, and there would be great gain in the demand for something more than a "passing" knowledge of the subject-matter taught. So, too, the dull round of yearly grade-work will give place to the interest that life processes always yield

to those who watch them. If the biologist scanning the lowest forms of life is thrilled with the thought of viewing the beginnings of the great mystery of conscious existence, how much more must be the joy which discerns the spark divine lighting a living soul. Higher than this, and crowning it, is the consciousness to the teacher of being not merely a passive observer of this mentality, but a director of it if not its occasioner. There can be no higher office than to do such service well.

Man's economic condition is a most important, if not the chief factor in his development. Economic conditions have largely determined the history of the race. The individualistic element in economics is one of the arguments used for individualism in Education, since Economics is one of the determining sciences in Educational theory. But Economic wants are not fixed and unchangeable.
in

Society is not static, but is constant change. Some change in individual wants is the ultimate cause of this dynamic condition. If men's wants remained the same in kind and amount Society would continue the same. What, then, brings these changes in economic wants? Clearly some sub-

jective change in man wrought by a change in objective conditions, or by some change in his development. Through these changes economic improvement comes. The great economic hope lies in an advance in the standard of living; which is to be attained by improving the individual wants of men; but this is only saying, by improving mankind, thus bringing the work home to the teacher. The higher standard of living is first set by those individuals who wishing for something better than their fathers knew strive for it and happily succeed. May this yearning be awakened in others, or must it spring solely in minds gifted by nature with spontaneity? Both may be true, but the great mass is uplifted in the desire for better living by education;- an education that has led the individuals of the social mass to want better economic conditions. Some economic writers have denied the right to this science to deal with the betterment of social conditions, but the art of economics, at least, will heed this phase of the question. Mill tells us such changes

-
1. See Walker, Page 312.
 2. " Clark, Page 40.
 3. " Walker, Page 21.
 4. " Walker, Page 20.

will be slow, but he believes a better educational opportunity would react most favorably on economic conditions.

A better taste is to be cultivated in children, their feelings and sentiments are to be elevated,- but all is to be attained by touching this and that individual child.

The wants of the adult have become fixed, and even though low, will be steadfastly adhered to. In the education of the child, therefore, lies the opportunity for the economic advancement of the world.¹

No one now claims, I presume, that merely knowing the right leads positively to right doing; but all, certainly, will admit that knowledge of good and evil and the consequences thereof tend to establish the former. If to this knowledge can be added a feeling of desire towards the right there can be no doubt of the result. Knowledge of the true and the good and love for them gives perfect, ethical conduct. Practical ethics has real moral value; yet theoretic ethics can scarcely exist without something of the ethical feeling with it. A perfect Mephistopheles is not human.

- - - - -

1. Patton's Premises of Political Economy, P. P. 241-244.

Can practical ethics, then be taught? The usual form is, can morality be taught? Can our schools elevate the moral standard? The popular reply to both questions is affirmative. There is less unanimity, however, in saying the schools thus help society. A wide diversity of opinion exists here, and all admit its limits; many making them exceedingly narrow.

Right conduct has its motive if not source in the emotional nature. They do right who feel to do it. How, then, shall we train the child to proper feeling? If we can show it to be by individualistic teaching, we will have justified its claim to importance from an ethical point of view.

The individualization of moral teaching, says
¹Adler, "Is of the greatest importance. The teacher should remember that he is educating, not boys and girls in general, but particular boys and girls each of whom has particular faults needing to be corrected, and actual or potential virtues to be developed and encouraged." That is, the teacher must have minute, accurate, and specific knowledge, personally, of each child he is to train morally. Adler

- - - - -

suggests, further, that he must not rest content with his own knowledge of the child, but should gather from all other teachers having had charge of the child; from its parents; and without seeming "to pry", if possible from its associates. The latter is a most delicate, but important point. Children often know of each other what parents or teachers may not know. How often we discover facts concerning a child which astonish and startle us.

An intimate knowledge of the child is a prime necessity, and the basis of individualistic training; but it is not the training, and the training is the all-important element. To know perfectly the child's nature yet not to change him, may be of interest, even of use, to the teacher, but is valueless to the child.

The moral influence that is to control the child must, evidently, seize and hold him personally. The personal influence of the teacher must direct the child. The absolute necessity of the personal power of the teacher is so universally acknowledged, the assertion thereof becomes a truism, yet little attention has been given to its practical application in the school-room. The teacher's power to

influence is limited. He can guide, properly only those over whom he has obtained a personal control; a restraining influence having its source in the emotions. Love and sympathy between teacher and pupil, care and solicitude of teacher for pupil, respect and even veneration of pupil for teacher are the bonds binding the child to voluntary obedience, and making him pliant to his teacher's will. Such moral training is personal and individualistic.

The combination of the over-crowded school and the weak teacher is the culmination of the evil to be avoided. Sympathy backed by force of will is perhaps the strongest motive power the teacher can bring to bear upon a pupil; but to exert fullest force the relation must be intimate, and to be intimate it should be restricted.

Fewer children in each class, and the class properly subdivided, is the necessary condition for the realization of individualized teaching. Herein is the virtue of the small, ungraded country school that has been so much commended.

To reach the desired ethical result the teacher must have no more pupils than can be taken into his intimate

acquaintance, that each pupil shall feel the close, personal knowledge of him and care for him. The intellectual work of the class also requires personal supervision, but not to the extent moral training does. The explanation of a scientific process, or the statement of a fact may be made to a hundred as to one; but the sympathetic inquiry whether all be well, the kindly advice, the earnest counsel must be individual to be effective.

Much questioning among teachers has brought only affirmations to this claim for the need of individualized training in morals. "Moral Education is everywhere acknowledged to be the most important part of all education." Admitting the truth of these words, and accepting our argument, it follows that the most important part of all education depends upon individual training.

Sociology, as the science of the development of society, may not care theoretically for the well-being of society, but practically this cannot be true. The sociologist, having learned the laws governing the development

- - - - -

1. Dr. Harris.- Preface to Adler's "Moral Instruction."

of society, must see clearly what tends to its betterment, what retards, what arrests, and what positively deteriorates and degrades. Knowing this, he cannot be indifferent, but must aid wherein he can to ameliorate and elevate society, and oppose every hinderance to its interests.

Sociology is not individualistic only in theory; does not merely formulate the laws of social development, but speaking with scientific authority it states what should be done to better the social condition of man.

"Society is an organization whose function is to develop conscious life and to create human responsibility; to that end it now exists. It is conscious association with his fellows that develops man's moral nature. To the exchange of thought and feeling all literature and philosophy, all religious consciousness and public polity are due, and it is the reaction of literature, and philosophy, of worship and polity, on the mind of each generation that develops its type of personality. Accordingly we may say that the function of social organization which the sociologist must always keep in view is the evolution of person-

ality through ever higher stages, until it attains to the
 //1
 ideal that we name humanity.

The function of society, therefore, is to attain its ideal through the evolution of personality. It is to be accomplished by a "conscious association" of each "with his fellows"; it is in childhood however such associations are most influential and can be most strongly for good when best directed. But directing and training form education. Further, the very content of education, philosophy, literature, politics, religion are to be made to react on the mind of each generation and thus develop it into that type which society deems the best. No doubt the author has, in this, the social mind somewhat in view. He says, "it (the social mind) exists only in individual minds and we have no knowledge of any consciousness but that of individuals." The social mind certainly dominates every individual will, but it is only an aggregate of individual minds and can be reached through them alone.

- - - - -

1. Gidding - Sociology, Page 421.
2. " " Page 184.

Whatever we would have the social mind to be we must give to the individuals that compose it. This relation of the individual to society and his influence upon it is thus strongly stated by Giddings:¹ "A social being, the normally organized man returns to society with usury the gifts wherewith he has been by society endowed. Personality cannot live within itself to perish with the individual mind. It goes forth to the everlasting life of man. And so little by little, age by age, society, which has created man, is by man transformed. Of supreme importance in this work is the influence of those few transcendent minds whose genius pierces the unknown, of those pioneers of thought and conduct who dare to stand alone in untrodden ways and reveal the possibilities of a spiritual life. It is chiefly through these that the mass of humanity is lifted some small degree above the plane of physical necessity into the freer air of liberty and light." May we add that what is so grandly true of these heroic souls is in lesser degree true of every individual soul that, standing alone, has wrought

- - - - -

1. Gidding's Sociology, Page 422.

for good.

The importance to society of the individual life makes equally important its education. Society is giving, in education, to the individual what Gidding asserts he will return to it with usury. It is important, then, to make this interest-bearing capital as great as possible. Such investment is a perpetuity whose interest will be compounded while society endures.

Sociology thus emphasizes the value of the more-highly-endowed members of society, for the progress of the race depends upon them. This being true it follows that the bright pupils should be given every advantage possible for advancement. The less gifted and the dullard must not be left helpless in the inexorable struggle for existence, but their more able fellows need not plod with them from mere sentiment. A family that unites in helping the talented member through college to his profession, is instinctively in harmony with the absolute rule of social progress.

Since the foundation of government Politics has always been of practical moment; and since Plato and Aristotle

developed the science, it has never ceased to be of theoretic interest.

Politics, as the science of government, might seem to treat of man only in the aggregate; but in a democratic government the individual man must be taken as the political unit. In America our schools are to train for citizenship. Should this training be individualistic, or may we drill our pupils as we do our soldiers. A republic is threatened by two diametrically opposite dangers,- a purely-selfish individualism may disintegrate it, or an ignorant mass led by a cunning, selfish demagogue may overthrow it. Ignorance and license, which is degenerate freedom, are the sure precursors of anarchy. Bryce says, in America "Everything tends to make the individual independent and self-reliant."¹ "Special knowledge commands deference in applied science or in finance," but "does not command it in politics;" that is supposed to be "within the comprehension of every practical man." "The education of the masses," he remarks, "is superficial. It is sufficient to enable them to think they

- - - - -

1. Bryce- American Commonwealth, Vol. II, Page 27.

know something about the great problems of politics; insufficient to show them how little they know. The public elementary school gives everybody the key to knowledge in making reading and writing familiar, but it has not time to¹ teach him how to use the key."

"The political education of the average American voter stands high when compared with that of the average voter in Europe - - - but if compared with the functions which the theory of the American government lays on him is inadequate.- - This is not a reproach to the schools but a tribute to the American ideal." The American voter is "like a sailor who knows the spars and ropes of the ship, and is expert in working her, but is ignorant of geography and navigation; who can perceive that some of the officers are smart and others dull, but cannot judge which of them is qualified to use the sextant or will best keep his head² during a hurricane."

- - - - -

1. American Commonwealth, Page 276, Vol. II.
2. " " Page 277, Vol. II.

The only corrective for this inadequacy is making manifest in school the intellectual inequality of pupils. The work of the school-room must be so executed that the pre-eminence of the superior pupil be unquestioned. This must be emphasized by allowing every opportunity for the untrammelled advancement of the bright pupil. Were this individualistic plan pursued intellectual superiority would be undisputed at the close of school-life; and placing moral qualities on a similar basis "in pith o' sense and pride o' worth" we would establish character. Deference for real superiority is natural and would counteract any weak-minded jealousy that might be engendered. I do not mean to argue that juvenile or even adolescent superiority would absolutely determine adult predominance, but it would be presumptive evidence of such superiority; and would help to establish a criterion of worth in the community. What is well-fixed in childhood is not easily lost in maturity. The dull uniformity charged against our democracy may or may not be well founded; the mediocre level of the majority is however apparent, but Mr. Bryce sees in Education the

hope of "a larger crop of marked individualities" which thoughtful foreigners have deemed our great need. To attain in full degree this desired individuality there must be an opportunity for teachers to train wisely and consciously the specially-endowed pupil.

A democracy has need of great and noble leaders. Shall they not be fostered by education? The strong and worthy leader is the only safeguard against the domination and machination of a political demagogue. Train boys and girls to recognize true worth and superiority, and they will not be deceived by trickery and pretense. I admit this argument is based on the inequality of men, but is not the inequality a fact? If so, it is well to recognize it, and to know the significance of the declaration, "All men are created free and equal." Free to do and be all that is rightfully possible, equal to any in political rights; but superior only in real worth. Thus may the state "realize the reconciliation of individual freedom and the play of cultured interests with stable objectivity of law and an abiding consciousness of the greater whole in which we move."

1

- - - - -

A recognition of individual worth, individual rights and duties, and with it all the proper recognition of the supremacy of the state and that all are greater than any one, hereby indicated, will help us to avoid that "excessive development of individualism" which has been the ruin of the society developing it. Let us train the future citizens of America to make their country in fact what its motto declares it to be: many in one.

Christian theology must recognize the importance of individualism in teaching, for it is absolutely individualistic, and is emphatic in demanding that education shall aid in the religious advancement of man. No stronger claim can be made for education than the religious one; yet the need of the individual soul is considered. Christianity no longer indorses Charlemagne's whole-sale baptism of tribes and clans. Administering to the needs of every individual soul, enlightening every individual conscience, training every individual mind is the sacred duty of church and state and society. The school which stands for these in their relation to education, to meet this duty must be sufficiently individualistic in method to allow no buried talent.

Not even the "lost one" escapes the divine sympathy; human help should attempt no less. This is evidenced in the tender solicitude shown by Christian charity toward the unfortunate waifs whose natural protectors have failed in individual duty. The final emphasis given by our theology to individualism is that christian hope is personal,- "I know that my Redeemer liveth" is its formula. Immortality is a personal, infinite life.

Pedagogical theory was shown to be individualis-
¹tic; consistency would demand that the same should be its practice; in its own intrinsic worth lies the value of individualistic teaching. Interesting as its theory may be, essential as it is, yet of transcendent importance is the perfect practice. Though teachers have every gift of pedagogic science and understand all knowledge and have not this divine art it is as nothing to the souls to be ministered unto.

- - - - -

Not they who "die with all their music in them," but they who have sung the world's great songs have, like Buddha, "helped the world."

Plato said the danger of bad training is far worse than none at all. Such training is negative and to add to it is to subtract. Every fault in teaching may not be negative, but is nevertheless a loss. The miserly husbandman may have less than the generous one if the former sow not well. If our teaching is based on a truly scientific plan, by being put in close relation to the sciences which relate to man, it will gain not only their assistance but their respect. Nothing could be of greater advantage to the teacher than the close affiliation of pedagogy with science; what is of value to the profession of teaching is of equal value to the teacher. Whatever tends to heighten respect for the teacher is of like value to the pupil. Exalt the teacher and the pupil is uplifted. Strengthen and elevate the former's influence and the latter will be unconsciously led and directed. Obedience enforced, courtesy demanded, deference required may veneer a school and give a surface polish, but is only mental and moral serfdom;

not the freedom actualized in perfect manhood.

The teacher who does not inspire his pupils to earnest effort for the highest realization of self is a ruler only by social accident, not by natural right. When collectivism so prevails that the individual is ignored, a sacrifice has been made for which no brilliant general effect can atone.

The importance of the personality of the teacher lies in its power to affect the personality of the pupil. Face to face and heart to heart contact between teacher and pupil have much power for good. This power cannot be exerted effectively in a general way; it must be specific and individual. As a personal power it is emotional, but herein its value is increased. The whole world is controlled through its emotions, not by its intellect; emotion is communicated by living, personal contact, not by intellectual apprehension or abstract formula.

While we thus lay supreme stress on the emotional element in teaching for its moral and aesthetic value, we must

- - - - -

1. Rosenkrantz, Phil. of Education, Page 19.

not lose sight of its almost equal value intellectually. Often the individual child is in need of a word of explanation or some special help. He fails to understand the statement or demonstration given the class. Some point or logical connection is not caught,- the mental current is broken, and his mind's light will not work. Just here is required close, personal supervision. A word may restore the broken connection, but however slight the break it is no less vital. An electric current may go round the world on a proper conductor, but a thousandth part of an inch of insulation breaks it. The psychic current is no less sensitive; its only advantage being its power of self-direction and self-connection.

How slight a break between teacher and pupil has often led to permanent estrangement and even repulsion of similar emotional, mental poles; a vital point not understood has left a branch of study unintelligible, and led to an aversion to it. Every teacher of experience knows the frequency of these school difficulties, and how grave may be the result. If a more individual work may correct or even lessen this evil its importance must be admitted.

The opposite theory, viz.,- that provision for the means of education and permission to each child to appropriate as much as he can- is the best we can do,- abandons all idea of the power or mastery of one mind over another. Nothing has so much power over mind as mind and this is most potent when the mature mind directs and influences the immature. This is an extreme statement of a recognized pedagogic truth, viz., that Education is not creative, but only directive. We believe absolute creation to be a philosophic impossibility, but growth is a fact. Growth properly directed is development, but development may be akin to creation. New combinations, new forms may be effected, and if perfectly wrought might give a new earth. Who can tell what nature contains potentially? ^{May}~~Why~~ not optimism justly hope for an Eden yet to be?

"Through the ages one increasing purpose runs,

And the tho'ts of men are widened with the progress
of the suns."

May our work help to the fulfilment of this high cosmic purpose.

3 1198 05762 6264



N/1198/05762/6264X

378.748

Po P 1898.4

Michener,
Individualism in
Education.

378.748

Po P 1898.4

3 1198 05762 6264



N/1198/05762/6264X

TO